

Josh-B
Art

NOTES OF ADVANCED MANAGEMENT PROGRAM DTR-3449

STUDENTS' DISCUSSION WITH DCI

26 September 1973, 1600-1710

- Q: Now that we have completed what has come to be known as "Mr. Colby's management course," what do you expect from us that is different from what we may have already known?
- A: Five simple things. First, go back to your offices and tell your subordinates and superiors that I want each unit to figure out two or three objectives for the coming year. No more. Then have your people work on those objectives, don't bother them, let them get on with the job in the way they think is best. Let them alone for about a year. Second, decentralize the implementation of the objectives of your units, this is really the same thing as what I just told you. Third, after about a year conduct a post-audit, evaluate the results of how well your people are getting the job done and make the modifications that you think are appropriate. Fourth, stop giving me reports upon reports upon reports with 500 pages of boilerplate prose. Fifth, tell your people to learn to use computers, not to be afraid of them. But don't believe that they can do the analysis, let people do that and use the computers for data manipulation.
- Q: What is the DCI's philosophy of management?
- A: Decentralize project control. Establish simple objectives, few in number, post-audit. Stress quality and not quantity.
- Q: Does he believe it is understood and accepted by Agency managers?
- A: No, I don't believe that most Agency managers understand this yet. But we have only been at this management technique for about a year and a half. In another two or three years after I've made it clear that we should work on the Director's objectives and that I will follow up with my own post-audits, then my management philosophy will be more believable than it is now.

- Q: What are senior management's criteria for selecting middle managers for advancement to top management positions? What are the DCI's views on the role of middle managers and their shortcomings? How can they be more effective in supporting Agency management objectives? Does the DCI support the concept of dual career ladders for specialists and managers, which allows for equal advancement opportunities for both? Do you believe there is such a thing as a universal manager who can manage without substantive speciality?
- A: The word manager needs to be changed to leader. But leader needs to be more of a substantive person than a universal manager. He doesn't need to be the best scientist but he needs to understand the science that he is managing. This is different than in other agencies, here our driving element is substance. The way for a person to get from a grade 13-1/2 on up to a 16, 17, or 18, is for him to understand the technical substance first, and learn how to manage the people and the resources as he progresses. (summary)
- Q: Does the DCI envision greatly increased movement between Directorates of managers at the GS-13 to 15 level as part of an Agency Career Development Plan as opposed to Directorate or Career Service development planning? Is the compartmentation of collectors and analysts still valid?
- A: Mr. Colby responded positively to this question. The failure of past attempts to increase mobility between Directorates he hopes will be alleviated with the PDP exercise which he said it will become clear is the Director's PDP and not only a paper exercise at the Office level. The NIO program is another attempt that is somewhat related to this question. The NIO officers will serve the Director himself as staff officers. He will not be the producer, or the writer of the estimates. He will be responsible for organization of the analysts throughout the community and will be responsible for patching together their contributions which will then be submitted to our current estimates process. Some of the other papers that the Agency now produces but which don't find themselves inside a blue cover will also be submitted to the NIO procedure.

Q: Do you foresee your post-audit control procedures as a means of eliminating the Agency's excessive bureaucracy?

A: Never

Q: Considering the probable demands upon the DCI from the Intelligence Community, is it your intent to leave the defacto running of the Agency to the DDCI, a military careerist, or the Management Committee?

A: No. But the DDCI is my alter ego and I am his. The Management Committee won't run anything. It is a vehicle to get Deputies to talk to each other, decrease compartmentation, increase collaboration, and act as a forum for all DCI problems.

Q: Traditionally CIA has prided itself on its independence of judgement, letting the chips fall where they may. Recently there has been considerable emphasis on "policy support". Would you comment on the problem of serving our designated role yet preventing a "yes-man" relationship.

A: There is much confusion over the two words, "policy support." Our mission is to support the policy makers, not the policy of the makers. There is no danger in our becoming "yes-men" since Congress, the press, and most of all our own employees will be looking down our throats.

Q: To what extent does the DCI foresee basic changes in the Agency's size, purpose, mission and method of operation? For instance, have changes in the relative value of human versus technical intelligence collection altered the role of the DDO to the point where its utility may be open to question? What are your views if any to the organizational concept that calls for two Super Directorates (DDS&T and DD/M&S), one DDI Directorate, and a Mini-Directorate (DDO) as the Agency of the future?

A: Most of the decrease in size will be accomplished by normal attrition. Some of it will not be, and therefore, each of you will have to develop a tool to identify minimal performers. After a person's name has appeared on a list at the bottom for two or three years in a row, he will be

asked to seriously consider leaving the Agency for an alternate career. The DDO will have to prove itself. They will not be conducting operations for the next several years (CA-PM) but we will retain the capability in the event that the policy makers and Congress' mood should change in two or three years from now. We are strictly their servants on this question. In the meantime, the DDO will function only to collect intelligence. I don't mean reporting on a coup in Africa which we don't care about. Some field stations have lists of 20 or 30 objectives. Maybe they should only be working on one and that won't be to report on a coup that the New York Times can report on. I'll personally take the heat on those questions. The people in the field may more productively try and recruit, for example, one of the 131 Soviets in that African country instead. Their successes will be even more quiet than in the past. Technological intelligence is terrific but it is time limited, and the real questions this Agency needs to turn to now are ones of human intentions, people-to-people dynamics and political dynamics. We need to know about the missiles, naturally, but do you think the Soviet Union thinks, to put the shoe on the other foot, that even with all of our missiles we intend to use our military power to attack another country? Of course not. There will not be any large Directorate reorganizations. Over the period of years there may be some slow ones but it will be a continuing and on-going process. We are finished with our large reorganization.